

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 21, 24, 27 and 30. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments, as support therefor is found throughout the specification and drawings.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132 as introducing new matter. The passage objected to corresponds with Claim 24. As noted below with respect to Claim 24, each element of the claim is fully supported by the original disclosure. In any event, in order to further prosecution, amendments to the specification have been made. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 24-29 were objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and for containing minor informalities. Claim 27 has been amended to correct the minor informality.

Regarding Claim 24, it is respectfully submitted that this claim, as presented, is fully supported by the original disclosure. In particular, "a memory" is clearly shown in Figure 1 as storage section 3. With respect to a preferred embodiment, the original specification explains each component stored in the memory or storage section 3. Referring to Figure 1, the storage section 3 contains "templates" in the document template storage area 13, "group names associated with a plurality of registrants" in the group table 12, "mail addresses related to the plurality of registrants" (as shown in

Figure 2) in the destination table 11. With respect to Figure 7, a process is shown.

Regarding the "rules for settings", clear support is provided in the description associated with step n5 of Figure 7. With particular reference to the version of the substitute specification that illustrates the changes made, at pages 16-19, the terms property and setting are used interchangeably and a plurality of associated rules (1)-(5) are described.

Regarding the "a processor", it is shown clearly in Figure 1 as control section 2, which is shown in operative communication with the storage section 3. Below, support for each step which the processor performs is with reference to the version of the substitute specification that illustrates the changes made.

As for step (i) of Claim 24, page 14, lines 17-27 and page 15, lines 13-15 along with step n1 of Figure 7 and the associated description provide ample support. As for step (ii) of Claim 24, see step n2 of Figure 7 and page 15, lines 15-25 for support. As for step (iii) of Claim 24, see step n3 of Figure 7 and page 15, lines 17-25 for support. As for step (iv) of Claim 24, see step n4 of Figure 7 and page 16, lines 8-20 for support. As for step (v) of Claim 24, see step n4 of Figure 7 and page 16, lines 8-20 for support. As for step (vi) of Claim 24, see step n5 of Figure 7 and page 16, lines 8-20 for support.

In view of the support specifically stated above and in other locations throughout the original specification, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would recognize that the inventors were in possession of the subject invention at the time of filing. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 21-23 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Japanese Publication No. JP-A 5-219103 to Iida. The Examiner's grounds for rejection are herewith traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

lida discloses an electronic mail system. The lida electronic mail system has a user input section 1. A user inputs a message by the user input section 1 and sets up various conditions. One of the conditions is destination information such as an individual or a group name in input area 21. If a group name is specified for the destination of the email, certain members of the group can be excluded from receiving the email if the user enters their names in an exclusion area 22. Thus, the system of lida is dependent on the user input.

In contrast, Claim 21 recites a method for composing electronic mail message including the steps of composing a body of a message, selecting registrant data for a prescribed area, selecting attributes and a setting for association with the body of the message, the attributes and the setting for automatically determining a list of recipients of the message according to the registrant data in the prescribed area and sending the message to the list of recipients. Consequently, once the attributes and settings are selected, the user is not required to take any further action to determine the list of recipients. Lida does not disclose or suggest such a step. Accordingly, Claim 21 and each of the remaining claims depending therefrom distinguish the subject invention from Lida and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claim 30, and e-mail apparatus including, *inter alia*, second means for selecting registrant data for a prescribed area, third means for selecting attributes and a setting for association with the body of the message, the attributes and the setting for determining, without user intervention, a list of recipients of the message according to the registrant data in the prescribed area is recited. Consequently, the user is not required to take any further action to determine the list of recipients. Lida does not disclose or suggest such a structural configuration. Accordingly, Claim 30 and each

of the remaining claims depending therefrom distinguish the subject invention from Lida and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 04-1105. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now remaining in this application, namely Claims 21-34, are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number set forth herein below.

Dated: February 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By George Chaclas

George N. Chaclas

Registration No.: 46,608

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(401) 276-6653

Attorney for Applicants